DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 854 EC 160 874

AUTHOR	Knox, Stanley C.
TITLE	Staff Development Needs in Special Education: A Minnesota Study. Program Assistance Report No. 9.
INSTITUTION	Upper Midwest Regional Resource Center, Minneapolis, MN.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Mar 82
CONTRACT	300-800-719
NOTE	116p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; Special Education; *Staff Development; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Minnesota

ABSTRACT

The study surveyed local education agencies in Minnesota concerning staff development needs for personnel serving handicapped children. Questionnaires were developed for direct service providers as well as for program administrators. Data provided information on characteristics of direct service personnel (including position type, licensing, and level of primary responsibility) and on their inservice training needs. Primary needs identified were design and implementation of educational programs, techniques of behavior management, and evaluation of student performance. Consistency was noted across groups and across regions in the state. Ratings are presented for teachers of the educable and trainable mentally retarded, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, visually handicapped, hearing handicapped, physically disabled, speech impaired; regular class teachers; social workers; school psychologists; vocational education teachers; and related service personnel. Analysis of questionnaires completed by 271 administrators presented information on inservice needs according to position and region. Among those items rated highly by the total group were designing staff development programs, evaluating instructional programs, and supervising and evaluating special education personnel. Recommendations were made for renewed efforts at statewide cooperation and coordination among training institutions and for developing training based on regional needs. (CL) disabled, speech impaired; regular class teachers; social workers; school psychologists; vocational education teachers; and related service personnel.

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236854

UMRRC Upper Midwest Regional Resource Center

STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION: A Minnesota Study

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Program Assistance
Report No. 9

EC160874

Department of Psychoeducational Studies • College of Education • University of Minnesota

STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION: A Minnesota Study

Prepared By

Stanley C. Knox

St. Cloud State University

March 1982

This report was supported by the U.S. Department of Education through a Special Education Programs contract with the Upper Midwest Regional Resource Center, Department of Psychoeducational Studies, College of Education, University of Minnesota (Contact No. 300800719). Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. The opinions expressed, therefore, do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Purpose	2
Method	2
Questionnaires	4
Procedures	6
Results	6
Characteristics of Direct Service Sample	9
Inservice Training Needs of Direct Service Personnel	14
Inservice Training Needs of Administrators	43
Conclusions and Recommendations	53
Appendices	66

INTRODUCTION

It has long been an accepted responsibility of education to insure students instruction which will maximize their potential. To continue progress toward this goal, it is necessary that the skills of the teachers be maintained and improved.

For those providing educational services to handicapped children, the problem is complicated by several factors: First, fewer new teachers will be entering the field in the next few years than during any other recent period. This suggests that there is and will be an increasing proportion of teachers of handicapped children who may not be current in their approaches to teaching handicapped students. Second, is the complicating factor that there has been a massive expansion of knowledge in the field of special education in recent years, which increases the discrepancy between the functioning level of teachers and current "best practices." A few examples will suffice. There is no question but that the amount and the quality of new commerical materials have increased very rapidly in recent years. Many of these new materials for instruction, assessment and development are available, but frequently are not used by teachers because of the lack of knowledge as to their application. Also, there is the impact of technology upon educational programs for handicapped students; a development just beginning to be noticeable. The influx of microprocessors in the schools is one small indication of this developing trend. Another example which one can cite is the discrepancy between research findings and current practices in the schools. The recent expansion of faculties at universities and colleges has resulted in a corresponding increase in research and the concomitant problem of translating that research into practice. These conditions, among others, have created a situation in which systematic

and comprehensive staff development opportunities must be made available to those who are responsible for the education of handicapped children. Assessment of specific staff development needs represents a first step in the process.

Purpose

In order to plan a comprehensive program of staff development, it is necessary to know the staff development needs of the population to be served. This study is based upon the premise that the best source of that information are those who are most directly affected. Therefore, the study surveyed persons responsible for providing direct services to handicapped children as well as those who are responsible for the administration of the programs. The overall goal for this activity was to provide a definitive statement regarding the Minnesota state-wide inservice needs for personnel in local schools who are responsible for providing an education to handicapped children. In addition, it is anticipated that the results of this survey will be useful in planning inservice activities for designated specific groups, and for region-wide activities. Local educational units who have participated in the study may also want to use this information for their own planning purposes.

Method

The State of Minnesota has been divided into a number of educational regions by the state government. The map in Figure 1 shows the regions of the state as it has been divided. Until recently, each of these regions was served by a special education regional consultant who provided liaison services between the Minnesota Department of Education and the local educational units. These local units were primarily either single school districts or a

FIGURE 1: Minnesota State Education Regions

group of school districts that had been organized in a cooperative arrangement to provide special education services.

Originally, it was anticipated that the special education regional consultants would be the primary contact in assessing inservice needs. However, in the middle of the survey process, funding for regional consultants was removed and those positions were terminated. This event drastically altered the strategies to be used; in particular, the planned use of regional consultants was not possible.

Therefore, local education agencies, including both single school districts and cooperatives, were selected from each region. The questionnaires were routed through the director of special education in the selected agencies and contact was maintained with them in order to maximize the number of returns.

Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were developed for use in this study. One was designed for those who provide direct services to handicapped students and the other was for those who are responsible for the administration of programs.

Direct service personnel were defined as anyone who provided services directly to handicapped children, regardless of the role they might assume in providing such services. This group included teachers, psychologists, social workers, physical and occupational therapists and any others who might be employed by the schools to provide such services.

The questionnaire for direct service personnel included two major dimensions. The first dimension elicited information about the characteristics of the respondents. Items were developed which related to the school district, the level at which the respondent was providing services, their present position,

the licenses which they held, and the licenses which they desired.

The second portion of this questionnaire tapped inservice training needs. One item provided the respondents with nine broad areas of inservice training. Respondents were asked to rank the importance to themselves of these areas of inservice training. Another item consisted of 28 specific in-service training topics. The respondents were asked to rate those topics in terms of their own needs for specific skill development.

The items on this questionnaire were drawn from a number of other in-service training needs assessment instruments. The questionnaire was field tested on 70 practicing teachers and was reviewed by the principle investigators of the Upper Midwest Regional Resource Center. Changes were incorporated in the instrument as a result of these activities. The final instrument, as it was distributed to the respondents, can be found in Appendix A.

The questionnaire for the administrators was developed in a somewhat different manner. The Minnesota Department of Education had recently convened a group of administrators (directors of special education, superintendents, training program personnel, and regional consultants) who had completed a process in which one of the purposes was to define the skills needed for administering educational programs for handicapped children. Those skills formed the core topics incorporated into the questionnaire. The questionnaire was then reviewed by practicing school administrators and the principle investigators of the Upper Midwest Regional Resource Center and suggested changes were incorporated. A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix B.

For the purposes of this study, administrators were defined as any school official who had responsibility for developing, implementing, monitoring, or evaluating programs for handicapped students, but whose primary responsibility

did not include providing direct services. This group consisted of superintendents, central office personnel, principals, directors of special education, and coordinators of special education programs.

Procedures

Copies of both questionnaires were distributed to directors of special education in the selected educational units. They were asked to distribute one copy of the administrative questionnaire to each of the administrators in their unit. For teachers whose primary assignment was in a regular elementary or secondary building or whose primary assignment was itinerant among buildings, the directors were asked to distribute two copies of the teacher's questionnaire. Each of these questionnaires had a cover letter on it which requested the teacher to fill out one questionnaire themselves and to distribute the other questionnaire to a regular education teacher in their building. In this way, it was possible to obtain responses from regular classroom teachers as well as those in special education. For teachers who were in more restrictive facilities, it was requested that a single copy of the teacher questionnaire be provided to represent them.

The directors were also asked to collect the questionnaires and return them to the investigator for analysis of the responses.

RESULTS

The results of the study are presented in this section, according to the following organization. First, the characteristics of the direct service respondents are described. Secondly, the data on inservice training needs which was obtained from the direct service sample are described, and third,

TABLE 1: Level of Primary Responsibility

LEVEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
Pre-kindergarten	77	7
Elementary	614	53
Middle School	47	4
Junior High School	209	18
Senior High School	168	14
Other	51	4
TOTAL	1,166	100

TABLE 2: Type of Position of Respondents

POSITION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Regular Classroom	459	39
Educable Mentally Retarded	117	10
Learning Disabled	301	26
Emotionally Disturbed	33	3
Visually Handicapped	4	0
Hearing Handicapped	14	1
Crippled Children	3	0
Trainable Mentally Retarded	44	4
Speech Clinician	68	6
School Psychologist	20	2
School Social Worker	18	2
Related Services	7	1
Vocational Educational	13	1
Other	71	6
TOTAL	1,173	100

TABLE 3: Licenses Held by Respondents

LICENSURE AREA	NUMBER
Educable Mentally Retarded	214
Learning Disabled	342
Emotionally Disturbed	42
Visually Disturbed	4
Hearing Handicapped	17
Crippled Children	6
Trainable Mentally Retarded	111
Speech Handicapped	97
Elementary Education	647
Secondary Education	274
School Psychologist	19
School Social Worker	22
K-12 (phy. ed., music, etc.)	89
Early Childhood	43
Vocational/Special Needs	46
TOTAL	1,773

an analysis of the training needs of administrators is presented.

Characteristics of Direct Service Sample

Responses were received from 1,173 direct service personnel and 271 administrators. As one might predict from knowledge of the distribution of special education services in the schools, the majority of the teacher respondents were associated with the elementary school (53%). Another 32% were functioning at the secondary level, defined to include both junior and senior high schools. The breakdown of the level at which the respondents were functioning is included in Table 1.

As the information in Table 2 indicates, the largest single group of respondents was regular classroom teachers (39%). However, if one combines all of the respondents who were providing direct educational services to handicapped children, without regard to the category, 44% of the respondents were teachers of handicapped children. Another 11% were personnel who provide services, other than teaching, in support of programs for the handicapped.

Since it is apparent that many teachers hold more than one license, an attempt was made to determine the extent of occurrence of multiple licensing. The data in Table 3 indicate that the 1,173 respondents held a total of 1,773 licenses. When one combines all of the regular classroom licenses (elementary education, secondary education, and K-12), 1,010 of the respondents held a license in regular education. If one subtracts the 459 respondents who are teaching in regular classrooms, the data would indicate that 551 of the 714 special education personnel who responded to the questionnaire hold a license in regular education. This situation is probably the most frequent instance

of multiple licensure. That some special education licenses in Minnesota require regular education licensure prior to receiving the special education endorsement is probably related to this finding. However, there is also a significant group of special education teachers that has multiple licenses within special education fields.

In an attempt to gather more data relating to the licensure situation, a comparison was made between the licensure of individual respondents and the position which they currently hold. The data are presented in Table 4. In every direct service area, except for teachers of the visually handicapped, there are considerably more respondents who hold licensure than are teaching in that particular area. It could be inferred that these are primarily teachers who hold miltiple licenses and that they are likely to be teaching another category of handicapped child. This hypothesis tends to be confirmed by the data in the last column of Table 4. Approximately one-third of the teachers holding a license to teach educable mentally retarded children are teaching either trainable mentally retarded or learning disabled children. Eleven percent of the teachers with licensure to teach the learning disbled are teaching either educable mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed children. Thirty-seven percent of teachers holding a license to teach emotionally disturbed are teaching learning disabled, and fifty percent of the respondents with licensure to teach trainable mentally retarded students are teaching either educable mentally retarded or learning disabled.

As only licensure areas were used in analyzing the data in Table 4, data on programs serving handicapped children in early childhood programs were not reported, since Minnesota did not have such a license at the time these data

were collected. It was apparent from written responses on the questionnaire this this information would not surface in the analysis. However, it was particularly noticeable in the data on speech clinicians, since almost one-fourth of the respondents with this licensure were holding positions directed to early childhood.

Minnesota provides for provisional licenses in some categories of special education. Such licenses may be granted when a teacher has completed a limited number of college credits in an approved licensure program. Ninety-eight respondents reported holding provisional licenses, but even in these cases not all were teaching within the area in which the provisional licenses were held. As the data in Table 5 indicate, the pattern described for the sample with full licensure is repeated for provisionally licensed teachers, in that the respondents who hold provisional licensure show considerable overlap between licensure and function in the areas of educable mentally retarded, learning disabilities, emotionally disturbed, and trainable mentally retarded.

TABLE 4: Comparison of Licensure Status With Function

LICENSURE AREA	NUMBER WITH LICENSURE	NUMBER TEACHING IN CATEGORY	MOST FREQUENT OTHER CATEGORY*
Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR)	211	107	TMR (36), LD (33)
Learning Disabled (LD)	340	280	EMR (24, ED (14)
Emotionally Disturbed (ED)	41	22	LD (15)
Visually Handicapped (VH)	4	4	- - -
Hearing Handicapped (HH)	17	11	ElEd (3), EC (2)
Crippled Children ** (CC)	6	0	TMR (2), EMR (2)
Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR)	110	42	EMR (44), LD (11)
Speech (Sp)	97	68	Other (21) ***
Elementary Education (ElEd)	641	299	LD (217), EMR (56)
Secondary Education (SecEd)	272	150	LD (64), EMR (14)
School Psychology (S Psy)	19	19	- - -
School Social Worker (SSW)	22	22	- - -
K-12 (phy. ed., music, etc.) (K-14)	86	35	LD (17), EMR (11)
Early Childhood (EC)	42	26	LD (7)
Vocational Education (VE)	45	12	EMR (15), Regular Education (7)

* The abbreviations indicate the category in which the personnel are teaching with the numbers in each category in the parentheses.

** None of the teachers who reported teaching crippled children indicated that they held the appropriate license. Such teachers held either an EMR or TMR license.

*** These were predominantly speech clinicians who were functioning in early childhood/handicapped programs.

TABLE 5: Comparison of Provisional Licensure With Function

LICENSURE AREA	NUMBER WITH PROVISIONAL LICENSE	NUMBER TEACHING IN CATEGORY	MOST FREQUENT OTHER CATEGORIES
Educable Mentally Retarded	19	10	LD (5), Regular Education (3)
Learning Disabilities	41	31	EMR (7)
Emotionally Disturbed	24	9	LD (10), Regular Education (3)
Hearing Handicapped	3	2	LD (1)
Visually Handicapped	0	0	- - -
Trainable Mentally Retarded	11	4	EMR (5), LD (2)

Inservice Training Needs of Direct Service Personnel

Major Areas

The questionnaire provided an opportunity for the respondents in the direct service sample to provide information on their inservice training needs. Item seven on the questionnaire listed nine areas which the participants were asked to rank from "1", indicating highest need, to "9" indicating lowest need. The mean ranking for each item is shown in Table 6 with the item of greatest need at the top of the list and the remaining items in descending order. The major areas of concern for direct service personnel appeared to be in designing and implementing appropriate educational programs. Somewhat below this were behavior management and evaluation of student performance. The remaining areas were very closely clustered.

The mean rankings were also computed according to the position held by respondents. The results are reported in Table 7. It is apparent that for all of those groups who provide direct instructional services for students, the major need was assistance in designing and implementing appropriate instructional programs. This is the highest ranked need for all such groups except the teachers of the visually handicapped, where it was second ranked. The second greatest inservice need for each of the groups varied somewhat, but the two most common areas were in behavior management and the evaluation of student performance.

School psychologists and school social workers both gave the highest rankings to techniques of behavior management and second highest to assessment procedures. Related service personnel was most concerned with planning and using related services and secondly with assessment.

TABLE 6: Mean Rankings of Inservice Needs for Total Group

ITEM	MEAN RANK
Design and implementation of appropriate educational programs	3.80
Techniques of behavior management	4.48
Evaluation of student performance	4.81
Assessment procedures for handicapped students	5.13
Classroom organization and management	5.14
Development of individual education plans	5.23
Developing and implementing instructional support services (Level II)	5.34
Screening, identification, and referral of handicapped student	5.36
Planning and use of related services	5.46

TABLE 7: Mean Rankings of Inservice Needs by Position

Position	Inservice Items *								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Regular Teachers	5.08	5.88	4.74	4.04	4.66	5.56	4.13	4.10	6.47
Educable Mentally Retarded	5.76	4.46	5.99	3.49	4.29	5.20	5.03	5.38	5.16
Learning Disabled	5.52	5.22	5.47	3.56	5.27	5.53	4.62	5.74	3.92
Emotionally Disturbed	6.67	4.81	4.75	3.67	4.96	5.31	4.52	5.21	4.23
Visually Handicapped	8.50	1.00	7.50	3.50	4.50	3.50	5.50	7.50	3.50
Hearing Handicapped	6.46	3.52	6.15	2.85	3.38	5.54	5.36	6.31	4.67
Crippled Children	5.33	5.00	7.33	2.66	3.66	5.67	4.00	6.33	5.00
Trainable Mentally Retarded	6.02	4.25	6.21	2.64	4.64	5.50	3.88	4.69	6.81
Speech	5.20	3.43	5.19	3.34	4.92	5.28	5.45	7.81	4.27
School Psychologist	4.74	4.05	6.26	6.05	4.42	5.63	3.58	4.68	5.47
School Social Worker	4.94	4.50	5.43	6.06	5.87	4.93	1.94	5.06	6.27
Related Services	2.85	1.57	5.33	4.33	3.33	3.60	7.20	8.80	6.80
Vocational Education	4.69	4.92	4.77	5.31	4.30	5.15	4.62	5.38	5.84
Other	5.58	4.86	5.08	3.52	4.76	5.52	4.85	5.71	8.06
Combined	5.35	5.13	5.22	3.79	4.81	5.46	4.48	5.14	5.35

* The following items were ranked by the respondents and correspond to the numbers on the table:

1. Screening, identification and referral of handicapped students.
2. Assessment procedures for handicapped students.
3. Development of individual educational plans.
4. Design and implementation of appropriate instructional programs.
5. Evaluation of student performance.
6. Planning and using related services.
7. Techniques of behavior management.
8. Classroom organization and management
9. Developing and implementing instructional support services (Level II).

Table 8 provides an analysis of the inservice needs by region. In every region the highest ranked need was in the design and implementation of appropriate instructional programs. Most frequently, the second highest ranking was given to techniques of behavior management with two regions indicating assistance in the evaluation of student performance as second most urgent need for training.

In summary, with regard to broad areas of inservice training, there is considerable consistency across the groups used in this survey and across the various regions of the state. The primary needs identified by direct service personnel are in the design and implementation of educational programs, techniques of behavior management, and the evaluation of student performance.

Specific Topics

Item eight on the questionnaire contained 28 specific topics which could be addressed through inservice training. Respondents were asked to rate their need for training in each of these specific areas on a scale of "1" to "5" with "5" indicating the greatest need. Mean ratings were computed for each specific topic and analyzed by position and by region.

In Table 9, the mean ratings for all respondents are reported, in order, from the greatest need to the least need. Nine of the top ten items are consistent with the results obtained in the previous section, indicating a need for assistance in instructional programs and methods, management of behavior, and measurement of student characteristics, behavior and academic progress.

The last column in this table shows which groups expressed the greatest need in each topical area. Perusal of that data fails to reveal any consistent pattern.

TABLE 8: Mean Rankings of Inservice Needs by Region

REGION	INSERVICE ITEMS *								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A	4.81	4.38	5.47	4.06	4.91	5.01	5.78	5.71	4.78
B	4.89	4.45	5.69	3.68	4.94	5.18	4.39	5.64	5.95
C	5.18	5.29	5.13	3.62	4.81	5.41	4.62	5.17	5.57
D	5.05	5.16	5.27	4.02	4.59	5.57	4.70	5.05	5.23
E	5.68	5.17	5.79	3.74	4.60	5.26	4.07	5.11	5.35
F	5.49	5.27	5.00	3.75	4.73	5.56	4.39	4.96	5.56
G	5.53	5.81	5.81	4.11	4.44	5.83	4.38	4.50	4.52
H	5.45	5.10	5.11	3.84	4.94	5.48	4.43	5.13	5.19

* The following items were ranked by the respondents and correspond to the numbers on the table:

1. Screening, identification, and referral of handicapped students.
2. Assessment procedures for handicapped students.
3. Development of individual educational plans.
4. Design and implementation of appropriate instructional programs.
5. Evaluation of student performance.
6. Planning and using related services.
7. Techniques of behavior management.
8. Classroom organization and management.
9. Developing and implementing instructional support services (Level II).

TABLE 9: Mean Ratings of Inservice Items for Total Group

ITEM LETTER	ITEM	RATING	SUB-GROUPS WITH HIGHEST RATINGS *
L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.68	EMH (3.85), Reg (3.81), TMR (3.77), LD (3.73), HH (3.71), CC (3.66), ED (3.58)
M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.54	TMR (3.70), Reg (3.70), CC (3.67), EMR (3.66), LD (3.57), ED (3.50)
K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas (reading, mathematics, etc.)	3.41	Reg (3.71), CC (3.67), EMR (3.66), LD (3.45), ED (3.27), HH (3.67)
O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.37	SSW (4.00), TMR (3.72), SPSY (3.50), Reg (3.49), LD (3.42), EMR (3.33), ED (3.33)
N	Implementation of various educational management systems (grouping, peer tutoring, etc.)	3.31	CC (4.33), EMR (3.42), LD (3.40), Reg (3.33), HH (3.28), TMR (3.28)
D	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	3.24	Rel (3.57), EMR (3.43), LD (3.42), CC (3.33), Voc (3.31), SPSY (3.25), Speech (3.23)
BB	Measuring student progress	3.23	HH (3.79), EMR (3.45), TMR (3.45), Reg (3.37), CC (3.33), Voc (3.30)
P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.23	SSW (4.00), EMR (3.47), ED (3.39), Reg (3.31), LD (3.23), HH (3.14)
F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.20	CC (4.33), HH (3.64), TMR (3.61), SSW (3.44), Speech (3.40), Voc. (3.28)
E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.11	HH (4.29), CC (4.00), TMR (3.63), EMR (3.62), Rel (3.57), Voc (3.15)
J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	3.09	HH (3.36), SSW (3.33), Voc (3.31), Reg (3.24), EMR (3.20), SPSY (3.20)

TABLE 9 cont...

ITEM LETTER	ITEM	RATING	SUB-GROUPS WITH HIGHEST RATINGS *
AA	Developing community living skills	3.08	TMR (3.91, Voc (3.54), EMR (3.53), HH (3.36), CC (3.33), SSW (3.33)
Q	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	3.06	Rel (3.86), TMR (3.67), SSW (3.50), ED (3.27), EMR (3.20), HH (3.14), Reg (3.14)
T	Knowledge of federal and state regulations	3.03	SSW (3.50), Rel (3.50), CC (3.33), Voc (3.15), SPSY (3.15), TMR (3.15), Reg (3.15)
S	Working with parents of handicapped students	2.96	SSW (3.94), CC (3.67), TMR (3.34), Rel (3.29), Speech (3.29), Reg (3.17)
U	Understanding of procedural safeguards	2.95	SSW (3.33), TMR (3.14), Reg (3.04), CC (3.00), EMR (2.95), Speech (2.95)
Z	Vocational careers/skills adjustment	2.89	Voc (4.15), VH (4.00), TMR (3.74), EMR (3.45), CC (3.33), ED (2.81)
C	Working with parents during screening and referral	2.88	SSW (3.72), HH (3.14), Speech (3.12), EMR (3.07), TMR (2.97), Reg (2.93)
W	Developing educational programs for handicapped children	2.86	Rel (3.86), TMR (3.61), HH (3.57), Speech (3.54), CC (3.33), EMR (3.09)
H	Reporting assessment results to parents and other school personnel	2.84	HH (3.57), Rel (3.11), Voc (3.00), Reg (2.99), EMR (2.94), TMR (2.80)
A	Recognition of possible signs of handicapping conditions	2.83	Reg (3.26), SSW (3.00), Speech (2.81), Rel (2.77), SPSY (2.71), EMR & LD (2.52)
B	Screening procedures for handicapping conditions	2.83	Voc (3.86), CC (3.67), SSW (3.00), EMR (2.94), TMR (2.93), Reg (2.92)
Y	Vocational assessment	2.83	Voc (4.15), TMR (3.77), EMR (3.45), CC (3.33), SSW (3.11), VH (3.00)

TABLE 9 cont...

ITEM LETTER	TITLE	RATING	SUB-GROUPS WITH HIGHEST RATINGS *
X	Developing vocational programs for young handicapped children	2.82	TMR (3.84), CC (3.67), EMR (3.37), Rel (3.14), Speech (3.14), SSW (3.06)
G	Role and functions of members of the staffing teams	2.79	Voc (3.00), Rel (2.94), SSW (2.90), Reg (2.92), EMR (2.87), HH (2.86)
R	Evaluation of media and materials	2.75	CC (3.33), Rel (3.29), EMR (2.86), TMR (2.84), Reg (2.80)
V	Identifying young (pre-school) handicapped children	2.73	Rel (3.43), Speech (3.39), SSW (3.39), TMR (3.27), HH (3.21), CC (3.00)
I	Understanding the major components of the individual educational plan	2.69	Reg (3.21), Voc (3.07), SSW (2.67)

* The following abbreviations are used in this table: Regular classroom teacher = Reg; Educable Mentally Retarded = EMR; Learning Disabled = LD; Emotionally Disturbed = ED; Visually Handicapped = VH; Hearing Handicapped = HH; Crippled Children = CC; Trainable Mentally Retarded = TMR; Speech Handicapped = Speech; School Psychologist = SPSY; School Social Worker = SSW; Related Services = Rel; Vocational Education = Voc.

Mean ratings were then computed for each respondent group included in the survey. The 10 highest rated topics for each group are shown in Table 10.

For each group, the 10 highest rated topics were defined as high priority topics. One topic surfaced among the high priority topics in 12 of the 13 groups. Every group except teachers of the educable mentally retarded and the related services respondents indicated a need for training in use of observation techniques as an assessment device. Although this item was the most consistently occurring across the respondent groups, it was ranked middle to low in priority in nearly all of the groups. The two groups ranking observation in the top three needs were teachers of crippled children of speech.

The highest rated need for the total group was in developing alternative instructional methods. It was also rated among the high priority topics for all respondent groups, except teachers of the visually handicapped and school social workers.

Another topic which appeared in the high priority group for all groups except regular classroom teachers, school psychologists, and school social workers was training in administration of appropriate assessment instruments.

Another frequently appearing topic was related to measuring student progress. Only teachers of learning disabled, crippled, trainable mentally retarded and related service personnel did not rate this topic as a high priority item.

TABLE 10: Highest Rated Inservice Needs by Position

POSITION	LETTER		RATING
Regular Classroom	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.81
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.71
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction (reading, Mathematics, etc.)	3.70
	O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.49
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.37
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.33
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.31
	A	Recognition of possible signs of handicapping conditions	3.27
	J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	3.24
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.21
Educable Mentally Retarded	L	Developing alternative instructional programs	3.85
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction (reading, mathematics, etc.)	3.66
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.66
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.62
	AA	Developing community living skills	3.53
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.47
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.46
	Y	Vocational assessment	3.45
	Z	Vocational careers/skills adjustment	3.45
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.43
	D	Establishing eligiblity of students for special education services	3.43

TABLE 10 cont...

POSITION	LETTER		RATING
Learning Disabled	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.73
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.51
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.45
	O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.42
	D	Establishing eligibility for students for special education services	3.42
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.41
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.23
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.06
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.01
	J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	2.89
	Q	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	2.88
Emotionally Disturbed	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.58
	M	Designing classroom for more effective individualization of instruction	3.50
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.41
	O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.39
	Q	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	3.27
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.27
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.06
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.03
	J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	2.93
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	2.81

TABLE 10 cont...

POSITION	LETTER		RATING
Visually Handicapped	Z	Vocational careers/skills adjustment	4.00
	AA	Developing community living skills	3.00
	Y	Vocational assessment	3.00
	X	Developing vocational programs for handicapped children	2.75
	BB	Measuring student progress	2.50
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	2.50
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	2.50
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	2.50
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	2.25
	T	Knowledge of federal and state regulations	2.25
	U	Understanding procedural safeguards	2.25
Hearing Handicapped	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	4.29
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.78
	S	Working with parents of handicapped students	3.71
	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.71
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.64
	H	Reporting assessment results to parents and other school personnel	3.57
	W	Developing educational programs for young handicapped children	3.57
	AA	Developing community living skills	3.36
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.29
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.29

TABLE 10 cont...

POSITION	LETTER		RATING
Crippled Children	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	4.33
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	4.33
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	4.00
	B	Screening procedures for handicapping conditions	4.00
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.67
	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.67
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.67
	Q	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	3.67
	S	Working with parents of handicapped students	3.67
	X	Developing vocational programs for handicapped children	
Trainable Mentally Retarded	AA	Developing community living skills	3.90
	X	Developing vocational programs for handicapped children	3.84
	Y	Vocational assessment	3.77
	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.77
	Z	Vocational careers/skills adjustment	3.74
	O	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	3.73
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.70
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.62
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.62
	W	Developing educational programs for young handicapped children	3.61

TABLE 10 cont...

POSITION	LETTER		RATING
Speech	W	Developing educational programs for young handicapped children	3.54
	V	Identifying young (pre-school) handicapped children	3.39
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.39
	S	Working with parents of handicapped student	3.29
	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.26
	D	Establishing eligiblity of students for special education services	3.23
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.13
	C	Working with parents during screening and referral	3.11
	X	Developing vocational programs for handicapped children	3.05
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.04
School Psychologist	O	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	3.50
	M	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.30
	D	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	3.25
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.20
	J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	3.20
	T	Knowledge of federal and state regulations	3.15
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.15
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.13
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.10
	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.10

TABLE 10 cont....

POSITION	LETTER		RATING
School Social Worker	O	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	4.00
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	4.00
	S	Working with parents of handicapped students	3.94
	V	Identifying young (pre-school) handicapped children	3.89
	C	Working with parents during screening and referral	3.72
	T	Knowledge of federal and state regulations	3.50
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.44
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.35
	AA	Developing community living skills	3.33
	J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	3.33
Related Services	W	Developing educational programs for young handicapped children	3.86
	Q	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	3.85
	B	Screening procedures for handicapping conditions	3.85
	D	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	3.57
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.57
	T	Knowledge of federal and state regulations	3.50
	V	Identifying young (pre-school) handicapped children	3.42
	R	Evaluation of media and materials	3.29
	S	Working with parents of handicapped students	3.28
	F	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.28

TABLE 10 Cont...

POSITION	LETTER		RATING
Vocational Education	Z	Vocational careers/skills adjustment	4.15
	Y	Vocational assessment	4.15
	AA	Developing community living skills	3.54
	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.46
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.31
	D	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	3.31
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.23
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.15
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.15
	T	Knowledge of federal and state regulations	3.15

The analysis of these inservice training needs by Minnesota regions can be found in Tables 11 and 12. Table 11 shows ratings of all topics while Table 12 shows the 10 highest rated needs for each region. Three high priority needs appeared in the top 10 for all regions: developing alternative instructional methods, designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction, and various approaches to curricular areas.

The use of observation techniques as an assessment device was rated high in all regions except D. Implementation of various educational management systems was rated high in all except Regions B and C. While Regions A and C did not rate the topic of designing classroom for more effective behavioral management in the top 10, all other regions did. Measuring student progress was rated high in all regions except A and E.

Licensure

The respondents were also asked if they were interested in obtaining licensure in any category of special education. Table 13 contains an analysis of the responses to this item according to the positions held by the respondents. The greatest demand for licensure programs appear to be in the areas of teaching emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, and young handicapped children.

The vast majority of those who would like to obtain a license to teach emotionally disturbed are those presently teaching learning disabled students, although relatively large numbers of regular classroom teachers and teachers of the educable mentally retarded also expressed such wishes.

TABLE 11: Mean Ratings of Inservice Needs by Minnesota State Regions

ITEM LETTER	ITEM	REGION A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
A	Recognition of possible signs of handicapping conditions	3.25	3.12	2.95	3.05	2.85	2.65	3.11	2.72
B	Screening procedures for handicapping conditions	2.94	2.90	2.91	3.00	2.63	2.81	2.75	2.83
C	Working with parents during screening and referral	3.09	2.87	2.89	3.21	2.80	3.02	2.71	2.80
D	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	3.47	3.30	3.24	3.32	3.08	3.09	3.53	3.27
E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.44	3.21	3.12	2.89	3.18	3.13	3.07	3.05
F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.47	3.37	3.37	2.95	3.15	3.19	2.71	3.18
G	Role and functions of members of the staffing teams	2.94	2.66	2.77	2.97	2.79	2.86	2.36	2.82
H	Reporting assessment results to parents and other school personnel	2.87	2.71	2.85	2.85	2.69	2.91	2.65	2.87
I	Understanding the major components of the individual educational plan	2.69	2.62	2.71	2.87	2.63	2.73	2.45	2.69
J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	3.25	3.06	3.09	3.05	3.13	3.17	3.29	3.04
K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas (reading, mathematics, etc.)	3.59	3.52	3.52	3.26	3.80	3.26	3.73	3.31

TABLE 11 cont...

ITEM LETTER	ITEM	REGION A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.78	3.71	3.77	3.69	3.92	3.64	3.87	3.58
M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.68	3.77	3.41	3.21	3.76	3.52	3.98	3.47
N	Implementation of various educational management systems (grouping, peer tutoring, etc.)	3.56	3.27	3.23	3.13	3.46	3.33	3.67	3.25
O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.22	3.41	3.17	3.26	3.35	3.46	3.87	3.39
P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.06	3.42	3.18	3.00	3.20	3.21	3.47	3.24
Q	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	3.44	3.11	3.02	3.15	2.86	3.07	3.06	3.08
R	Evaluation of media and materials	2.77	2.83	2.73	2.69	2.84	2.73	2.83	2.74
S	Working with parents of handicapped students	3.16	3.07	3.04	3.08	2.85	3.05	2.76	2.89
T	Knowledge of federal and state regulations	3.26	3.15	3.06	3.29	2.87	3.11	2.58	2.99
U	Understanding of procedural safeguards	3.00	3.08	2.94	3.13	2.73	2.99	2.47	3.00
V	Identifying young (pre-school) handicapped children	2.91	2.91	2.86	3.03	2.34	2.82	2.36	2.67
W	Developing educational programs for young handicapped children	3.06	3.08	2.95	2.97	2.47	2.96	2.40	2.84

TABLE 11 cont...

ITEM LETTER	ITEM	REGION A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
X	Developing vocational programs for young handicapped children	2.97	3.18	2.91	2.95	2.65	2.85	2.35	2.76
Y	Vocational assessment	3.38	3.23	2.78	2.79	3.06	2.90	2.31	2.74
Z	Vocational careers/skills adjustment	3.45	3.32	2.81	2.87	3.13	2.94	2.38	2.81
AA	Developing community living skills	3.34	3.24	2.95	3.23	3.11	2.99	2.69	2.98
BB	Measuring student progress	3.53	3.45	3.31	3.44	3.12	3.22	3.35	3.13

TABLE 12: The 107 Highest Mean Ratings of Inservice Needs by Minnesota State Region

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
A	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.78
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.68
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.59
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.56
	B	Screening procedures for handicapping conditions	3.53
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.47
	D	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	3.47
	Z	Developing vocational programs for handicapped children	3.45
	Q	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	3.44
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.44
B	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.77
	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.71
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.52
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.45
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.42
	O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.41

TABLE 12 cont....

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
B	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.37
	Z	Vocational careers/skills adjustment	3.32
	D	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	3.30
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.27
C	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.77
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.52
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.41
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.37
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.31
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.30
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.27
	AA	Developing community living skills	3.24
	Y	Vocational assessment	3.23
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment devices	3.21
D	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.69
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.44
	D	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	3.32
	T	Knowledge of federal and state regulations	3.29

TABLE 12 cont...

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
D	O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.26
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.26
	AA	Developing community living skills	3.23
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.21
	C	Working with parents during screening and referral	3.21
	Q	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effecitive programming	3.15
E	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.92
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.80
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.76
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.46
	O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.35
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.20
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.18
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.15
	J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	3.13
	Z	Vocational careers/skills adjustment	3.13
F	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.64
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.52

TABLE 12 cont...

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
F	O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.46
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.33
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.26
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.22
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.21
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.19
	J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	3.17
	E	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	3.13
G	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.98
	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.87
	O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.87
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.67
	C	Working with parents during screening and referral	3.53
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.47
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.35
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.31
	J	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	3.24
	A	Recognition of possible signs of handicapping conditions	3.11

TABLE 12 cont...

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
H	L	Developing alternative instructional methods	3.58
	M	Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	3.47
	O	Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	3.39
	K	Various instructional approaches to curricular areas	3.31
	D	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	3.27
	N	Implementation of various educational management systems	3.25
	P	Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	3.24
	F	Observation techniques as an assessment device	3.18
	BB	Measuring student progress	3.13
	Q	Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	3.08

Those expressing a desire to obtain a license to teach young handicapped children came primarily from the ranks of regular classroom teachers and teachers of the learning disabled, although teachers of the mentally retarded (both educable and trainable) and speech clinicians contributed significant numbers as well.

Those who wish to obtain a license to teach learning disabled children are primarily regular classroom teachers. A substantial number of teachers of educable mentally retarded children also indicated such an interest.

The regional analysis of the responses to this question are in Table 14. These data suggest that the largest number of teachers desiring to obtain some type of special education license are in Regions H, C, and F. In each region, the licensure programs of greatest interest are in teaching emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, and early childhood.

TABLE 13: Licensure Desired by Position Held

Position	License											
	Educable Mentally Retarded	Learning Disabled	Emotionally Disturbed	Visually Handicapped	Hearing Handicapped	Crippled Children	Trainable Mentally Retarded	Speech	School Psychologist	School Social Worker	Early Childhood	Adaptive Physical Education
Regular Classroom	15	114	58	30	31	15	6	24	46	51	57	31
Educable Mentally Retarded	7	43	41	6	12	7	7	8	4	10	41	17
Learning Disabled	56	13	101	14	17	4	6	8	51	22	55	10
Emotionally Disturbed	3	11	8	1	3	2	-	2	7	7	1	-
Visually Handicapped	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Hearing Handicapped	-	2	-	-	2	-	1	2	3	1	5	-
Crippled Children	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1
Trainable Mentally Retarded	5	11	14	3	7	4	4	2	3	3	22	6
Speech	5	10	7	1	22	1	4	6	3	4	32	3
School Psychologist	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	0	1	-	1	-
School Social Worker	-	2	6	1	1	-	-	1	3	2	2	-
Related Service	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	3	1
Vocational Education	2	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	1	2
Other	3	11	8	6	9	3	6	-	5	2	21	10
Total	96	218	246	64	105	41	34	54	129	103	244	81

TABLE 14: Desired Licensure by Region

LICENSURE	REGION								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Total
Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR)	2	6	23	4	8	9	4	41	97
Learning Disabled (LD)	7	18	44	8	13	37	10	81	218
Emotionally Disturbed (ED)	4	21	56	6	28	41	9	78	243
Visually Handicapped (VH)	2	4	13	2	4	16	0	21	62
Hearing Handicapped (HH)	3	3	25	1	5	27	3	38	105
Orthopedically Handicapped (OH)	1	3	6	1	2	11	2	15	41
Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR)	2	1	8	2	2	8	2	9	34
Speech (Sp)	1	4	14	1	4	10	0	20	54
School Psychology (S Psy)	3	9	22	2	4	30	8	46	124
School Social Worker (SSW)	3	9	15	1	7	24	2	39	100
Early Childhood EC)	8	17	50	8	17	47	10	85	242
Adaptive Physical Education APE)	3	7	20	5	5	16	4	23	83
Total	39	102	296	41	99	276	54	496	

Summary

This survey of special education personnel and regular classroom teachers indicates that the greatest need is to make additional training available in the design and implementation of instructional programs. Several specific topics emerge from the analysis as high priority topics, whether one analyzes the data on the basis of the total group, position held, or region of the state. Those topics are:

(1) Developing alternative instructional methods.

(2) Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction.

(3) Various instructional approaches to curricular areas.

(4) Measuring student progress.

(5) Observation techniques as a method of assessment.

(6) Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management.

(7) Implementation of various educational management systems.

Beyond these priority topics, which are quite uniform, each region and each group displayed enough variability to suggest that the second tier of in-service training needs become much more specific to the group and region.

The desire for licensure programs in special education is concentrated in a few regions and is primarily focused upon programs for emotionally disturbed, early childhood, and learning disabilities.

Inservice Training Needs of Administrators

A total of 271 administrators returned the questionnaire. The distribution of those responds according to their position is given in Table 15. Over 60% were principals and another 15% were district administrators.

The mean ratings of inservice needs by administrators are found in Table 16, along with an indication of which groups of administrators rated the topic as greatest need. Needs are listed in order from highest priority to lowest.

Table 17 contains the results of the analysis according to the positions held by administrators. Only the 10 highest rated items for each group are given in this table. Table 18 is designed to provide data on the 10 highest rated items in each region of the state.

There are a number of items which are rated high by the total group, several sub-groups and several regions. These items are as follows:

(1) Designing staff development programs.

(2) Evaluating instructional programs.

(3) Alternative models for special needs.

(4) Procedures for assuring quality programs.

(5) Assessing staff development needs.

(6) Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel.

TABLE 15: Administrative Positions Held by Respondents

POSITION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Superintendent	27	10
Central Office Administrator	15	5
Elementary Principal	82	30
Secondary Principal	90	33
Special Education Director	16	6
Special Education Coordinator	21	8
Other	20	7
TOTAL	271	

TABLE 16: Mean Ratings of Inservice Needs by Administrators

ITEM LETTER	ITEM	TOTAL GROUP MEAN RATING	HIGHEST MEANS FOR SUB-GROUPS *
K	Designing staff development programs	3.48	SED (3.75), CO (3.73), SEC (3.57), EP (3.44)
N	Evaluating instructional programs	3.44	SED (4.00), SEC (3.57), CO (3.53), SP (3.41)
W	Alternative models for special needs	3.39	SED (3.63), S (3.56), EP (3.41), SP (3.23)
X	Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.37	SED (3.62), SEC (3.62), CO (3.53), S (3.41)
J	Assessing staff development needs	3.29	SP (3.36), SEC (3.33), CO (3.33), S (3.19)
I	Conflict management and resolution	3.18	SED (3.86), SEC (3.63), CO (3.40, EP (3.31)
C	Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel	3.18	SED (3.63), SEC (3.50), S (3.30, SP (3.27), EP (3.05)
T	Creating least restrictive alternatives	3.09	CO (3.27), S (3.15), SED (3.12), EP (3.10)
H	Communication strategies	3.06	SED (3.56), SEC (3.38), SP (3.04), S (3.04)
R	Program development strategies	2.99	SED (3.31), SEC (3.10), S (3.10), CO (3.00)
L	Evaluating management services	2.99	CO (3.40), SEC (3.40), SED (3.19), S (2.96)
P	Current case law in special education	2.92	SEC (3.29), S (3.26), EP (3.11), SED (3.06)
Q	Effective management of related services	2.91	SED (3.75), SEC (3.05), CO (3.00), EP (2.95)
Z	Goal development	2.87	CO (3.13), SED (3.06), SEC (3.04), S (2.96)
F	Administrative models in special education	2.86	SEC (3.86), SED (3.31), EP (2.84), CO (2.80)
G	School-community relationships	2.86	S (3.00), SP (2.93), SEC (2.90, SED (2.87)

TABLE 16 cont...

ITEM LETTER	ITEM	TOTAL GROUP MEAN RATING	HIGHEST MEANS FOR SUB-GROUPS *
M	Evaluating child-study systems	2.82	S (3.00), SP (2.89), SED (2.88), SEC (2.86)
U	Management information systems	2.78	SED (3.50), SEC (3.29), CO (3.13), EP (2.70)
O	Special education financing	2.71	S (3.52), SED (2.94), CO (2.93)
E	Due process and school expulsion	2.69	EP (2.94), SED (2.87), SEC (2.67), S (2.56)
V	Compliance management	2.68	EP (2.91), SEC (2.86), S (2.67), CO (2.67)
S	Agencies and organizations serving the handicapped	2.67	S (3.19), EP (2.82), SP (2.79
A	Assessing personnel needs in special education	2.65	S (3.03), SP (2.77)
D	Data privacy	2.60	SED (3.25), CO (3.00), S (2.78)
Y	Technology for conducting meetings	2.54	SEC (2.95), CO (2.93), SED (2.75), ED (2.64)
B	Recruiting and assigning special education personnel	2.22	SP (2.45), S (2.41)

* The following abbreviations are used in this table: superintendent = S; central office administrator = CO; elementary principal = EP; secondary principal = SP; special education director = SED; special education coordinator = SEC.

TABLE 17

TEN HIGHEST RATED ITEMS BY GROUPS OF ADMINISTRATORS

Superintendents		Central Office Personnel		Elementary Principals		Secondary Principals		Special Education Directors		Special Education Coordinators	
Item	Rating	Item	Rating	Item	Rating	Item	Rating	Item	Rating	Item	Rating
W - Alternative models for special needs students	3.56	K - Designing staff development programs	3.73	K - Designing staff development programs	3.44	N - Evaluating instructional programs	3.41	N - Evaluating instructional programs	4.00	F - Administrative models in special education	3.86
O - Special education financing	3.51	X - Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.53	N - Evaluating instructional programs	3.37	K - Designing staff development programs	3.40	I - Conflict management and resolution	3.86	I - Conflict management and resolution	3.63
K - Designing staff development programs	3.42	N - Evaluating instructive programs	3.53	X - Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.34	J - Assessing staff development needs	3.36	Q - Effective management of related services	3.75	X - Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.62
X - Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.41	I - Conflict management and resolution	3.40	I - Conflict management and resolution	3.31	C - Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel	3.27	K - Designing staff development programs	3.75	N - Evaluating instructional programs	3.57
C - Supervision & evaluation of special education personnel	3.30	L - Evaluating management services	3.40	J - Assessing staff development needs	3.19	W - Alternative models for special needs students	3.23	X - Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.63	K - Designing staff development programs	3.57
P - Current case law in special education	3.26	J - Assessing staff development needs	3.33	P - Current case law in special education	3.11	X - Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.22	W - Alternative models for special needs students	3.63	C - Supervision & evaluation of special education personnel	3.50
N - Evaluating instructional programs	3.23	T - Creating least restrictive alternatives	3.27	T - Creating least restrictive alternatives	3.10	H - Communication strategies	3.04	C - Supervision & evaluation of special education personnel	3.63	L - Evaluating management services	3.40
S - Agencies and organizations serving the handicapped	3.19	Z - Goal development	3.13	C - Supervision & evaluation of special education personnel	3.05	I - Conflict management & resolution	3.02	H - Communication strategies	3.56	H - Communication stragegies	3.38
J - Assessing staff development needs	3.19	U - Management information systems	3.13	R - Program development strategies	2.99	T - Creating least restrictive alternative	2.96	U - Management information systems	3.50	U - Management information systems	3.29
R - Program development strategies	3.11	W - Alternative models for special needs students	3.07	E - Due process and school expulsion	2.94	G - School-community relationships	2.93	F - Administrative models in special education	3.31	P - Current case law in special education	3.29
								R - Program development strategies	3.31		

TABLE 18: Highest Rated Inservice Needs by Administrators by Region

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
A	X	Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.67
	N	Evaluating instructional programs	3.58
	K	Designing staff development programs	3.51
	G	School-community relations	3.48
	H	Communication strategies	3.48
	T	Creating least restrictive alternatives	3.45
	S	Agencies and organizations serving the handicapped	3.38
	C	Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel	3.64
	J	Assessing staff development needs	3.67
	W	Alternative models for special needs students	3.24
B	I	Conflict management and resolution	4.25
	P	Current case law in special education	4.20
	V	Compliance management	4.00
	X	Procedures for assuring quality programs	4.00
	N	Evaluating instructional programs	3.75
	E	Due process and school expulsion	3.40
	R	Program development strategies	3.25

TABLE 18 cont...

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
B	T	Creating least restrictive alternatives	3.25
	U	Management information systems	3.25
	W	Alternative models for special needs student	3.25
C	J	Assessing staff development needs	3.52
	N	Evaluating instructional programs	3.53
	K	Designing staff development programs	3.39
	X	Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.38
	C	Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel	3.32
	W	Alternative models for special needs students	3.23
	T	Creating least restrictive alternatives	3.00
	G	School-community relations	2.98
	L	Evaluating management services	2.97
	Z	Goal development	2.97
D	K	Designing staff development programs	3.53
	J	Assessing staff development needs	3.40
	W	Alternative models for special needs students	3.33
	P	Current case law in special education	3.13
	C	Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel	3.07
	R	Program development strategies	3.06

TABLE 18 cont...

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
D	T	Creating least restrictive alternatives	3.00
	X	Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.00
	L	Evaluating management services	2.93
	I	Conflict management and resolution	2.80
E	N	Evaluating instructional programs	3.43
	K	Designing staff development programs	3.32
	W	Alternative models for special needs students	3.28
	I	Conflict management and resolution	3.24
	C	Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel	3.24
	P	Current case law in special education	3.10
	J	Assessing staff development needs	3.00
	H	Communication strategies	2.97
	R	Program development strategies	2.97
	S	Agencies and organizations serving the handicapped	2.97
F	W	Alternative models for special needs students	3.43
	N	Evaluating instructional programs	3.30
	C	Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel	3.29
	K	Designing staff development programs	3.26
	I	Conflict management and resolution	3.24

TABLE 18 cont...

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
F	X	Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.13
	J	Assessing staff development needs	3.12
	P	Current case law in special education	3.04
	L	Evaluating management services	2.98
	H	Communication strategies	2.95
G	K	Designing staff development programs	3.91
	X	Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.91
	N	Evaluating instructional programs	3.82
	C	Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel	3.63
	F	Administrative models in special education	3.63
	J	Assessing staff development needs	3.45
	R	Program development strategies	3.45
	W	Alternative models for special needs students	3.32
	I	Conflict management and resolution	3.27
	H	Communication strategies	3.18
H	K	Designing staff development programs	3.59
	W	Alternative models for special needs students	3.56
	X	Procedures for assuring quality programs	3.45
	O	Special education financing	3.45

TABLE 18 cont...

REGION	ITEM LETTER	ITEM	MEAN RATING
H	J	Assessing staff development needs	3.31
	I	Conflict management and resolution	3.28
	T	Creating least restrictive alternatives	3.27
	R	Program development strategies	3.08
	L	Evaluating management services	3.07
	H	Communication strategies	3.06

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions:

This survey assessed special education related staff development needs in the state of Minnesota by sampling public school personnel who are providing educational services to handicapped students. The data obtained suggest the following conclusions:

(1) As might be predicted from the known distribution of services to handicapped students, the majority of the respondents were employed in the elementary schools.

(2) There are a large number of teachers in the sample who hold licenses in several categories of special education, particularly among teachers serving mildly handicapped students. This finding has implications for licensure and employment policies, suggesting that a combined, non-categorical license for mildly handicapped may be desirable. Functionally, such a license is now being earned "the hard way" by many teachers, presumably because it fulfills a local school system need.

(3) The major area in which direct service personnel indicate a need for further training is in the design and implementation of appropriate educational programs.

(4) More specifically, direct service personnel indicate training needs in curricular adaptation, individualizing instruction, behavior management, educational management, and assessment of students.

(5) While there is considerable consistency on major training needs for direct service personnel, there is also diversity when the needs are analyzed by categories of teacher and by region of the state.

(6) Administrators tend to have needs which focus on staff development, supervision, and evaluation of both staff and programs.

(7) As with the direct service personnel, administrators also appear to show consistency with regard to major needs, but also some diversity when analyzed by position and by region.

Recommendations:

Based on the frequency with which certain staff development needs surfaced in both the direct service and administrator samples, there are some training needs, listed in Table 19, which could and probably should be addressed on a broad basis in order to assure full opportunity for school personnel to obtain the training for which they express a need.

All of the topics rated as high priority needs are currently taught in standard professional education course offerings at most of the colleges and university of Minnesota. However, for a variety of reasons related to accessibility, cost effectiveness of those offerings and content that is not always focused on current staff needs, the existing delivery system does not adequately mesh with staff development realities.

It is possible that renewed efforts at statewide cooperation and coordination among training institutions would contribute to improvements in the delivery of inservice training. While potentially useful, such coordination would be of little moment unless the separate institutions also began to make creative additions to their present methods of packaging and delivering inservice

TABLE 19: Statewide Inservice Needs

DIRECT SERVICE PERSONNEL

(1) Developing alternative instructional methods

(2) Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction

(3) Various instructional approaches to curricular areas

(4) Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management

(5) Implementation of various educational management systems

(6) Measuring student progress

(7) Observation techniques as an assessment device

ADMINISTRATORS

(1) Designing staff development programs

(2) Evaluating instructional programs

(3) Alternative models for special needs

(4) Procedures for assuring quality programs

(5) Assessing staff development needs

(6) Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel

training to educators. That is, the mechanisms for delivering knowledge and skills must be addressed. Additional means of delivery will have to be experimented with, if substantial progress of filling the identified needs is to be accomplished.

Among the likely possibilities are highly focused one-day workshops that combine theory, demonstration, and practice of the new skill. In such workshops, or other offerings, the use of video-taped demonstrations, simulations that challenge the student, micro-computer packages that develop specific skills, and similar means of delivering information are well within reach. Focus, specificity, practicality, and hands-on practice appear important to any such efforts.

Special education programs in Minnesota are reimbursed on a categorical basis. As a result, college training programs are designed to meet the needs of direct service personnel in each of the categorical areas. Unless and until that is changed, one method of providing for the diversity of needs is in-service offerings based upon those categorical divisions. Table 20 contains a listing of the high priority topics for each categorical group. Those needs may not be fully addressed through a system based only on functional needs without regard to category of handicap, but much overlap is quite obvious. Table 21 contains the specific topics rated as high priority by administrators for each group. These needs could be addressed through cooperative efforts, if the state education agency and the training institutions in the state utilized the unique resources available to each.

Several problems are inherent in this approach. First, without careful monitoring and cooperation, there can be no assurance that all areas of need would be systematically addressed. Second, geographical considerations may

prevent many of those who desire such training from participating, unless the training institutions develop more creative delivery systems as commented on above.

One possibility is to approch the training endeavor on a regional basis with leadership from an agency which can serve the entire state. Utilizing the resources of the training institutions and other agencies, training packages could be developed cooperatively and then delivered by colleges on a regional basis. The regional training needs, which could provide the basis for the development of inservice training at the regional level, are found in Table 22.

TABLE 20: Inservice Topics - Direct Service Personnel by Groups

REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

(1) Recognition of possible signs of handicapping conditions

(2) Developing goals and objectives from assessment data

(3) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom

TEACHERS OF LEARNING DISABLED

(1) Establishing eligibility of students for special education services

(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(3) Developing goals and objectives from assessment instruments

(4) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom

(5) Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming

TEACHERS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED

(1) Establishing eligibility of students for special education services

(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(3) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom

(4) Vocational assessment

(5) Vocational careers/skill adjustment

(6) Developing community living skills

TEACHERS OF EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED

(1) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(2) Developing goals and objectives from assessment data

(3) Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming

TABLE 20 cont...

TEACHERS OF VISUALLY HANDICAPPED

(1) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(2) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom

(3) Knowledge of federal and state regulations

(4) Understanding procedural safeguards

(5) Developing vocational programs for handicapped children

(6) Vocational assessment

(7) Vocational careers/skill adjustment

(8) Developing community living skills

TEACHERS OF CRIPPLED CHILDREN

(1) Screening procedures for handicapping conditions

(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(3) Utilizing appropriate educational personnel to develop more effective programming

(4) Working with parents of handicapped students

(5) Developing vocational programs for handicapped students

TEACHERS OF HEARING HANDICAPPED

(1) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(2) Reporting assessment results to parents and other school personnel

(3) Working with parents of handicapped students

(4) Developing educational programs for handicapped children

(5) Developing community living skills

TEACHERS OF TRAINABLE MENTALLY RETARDED

(1) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(2) Developing educational programs for handicapped children

(3) Developing vocational programs for handicapped children

(4) Vocational assessment

(5) Vocational careers/skill adjustment

(6) Developing community living skills

TABLE 20 cont...

SPEECH CLINICIANS

(1) Establishing eligibility of students for special education services

(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(3) Working with parents during screening and referral

(4) Identifying young (pre-school) handicapped children

(5) Developing educational programs for handicapped children

(6) Developing vocational programs for handicapped students

SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS

(1) Working with parents during screening and referral

(2) Developing goals and objectives from assessment data

(3) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom

(4) Working with parents of handicapped students

(5) Knowledge of federal and state regulations

(6) Identifying young (pre-school) handicapped children

(7) Developing community living skills

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

(1) Establishing eligibility of students for special education services

(2) Developing goals and objectives from assessment data

(3) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom

(4) Knowledgeable of federal and state regulations

RELATED SERVICES

(1) Screening procedures for handicapping conditions

(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(3) Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming

(4) Evaluation of media and materials

(5) Working with parents of handicapped students

(6) Knowledge of federal and state regulations

(7) Identifying young (pre-school) handicapped children

(8) Developing educational programs for handicapped children

TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

(1) Establishing eligibility of students for special education services

(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments

(3) Knowledge of federal and state regulations

(4) Vocational assessment

(5) Vocational careers/skill development

(6) Developing community living skills

TABLE 21: Inservice Topics For Administrators by Groups

SUPERINTENDENT

(1) Program development strategies

(2) Special education financing

(3) Current case law in special education

(4) Agencies and organizations serving the handicapped

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

(1) Creating least restrictive alternatives

(2) Program development strategies

(3) Current case law in special education

(4) Due process and school expulsion

DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

(1) Communication strategies

(2) Program development strategies

(3) Effective management of related service

(4) Management information systems

(5) Administrative models in special education

CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL

(1) Creating least restrictive alternatives

(2) Evaluating management services

(3) Goal development

(4) Management information systems

SECONDARY PRINCIPAL

(1) Creating least restrictive alternatives

(2) Communication strategies

(3) School community relationships

SPECIAL EDUCATION COORDINATOR

(1) Communication strategies

(2) Management information systems

(3) Administrative models in special education

(4) Evaluating management services

(5) Current case law in special education

TABLE 22: Inservice Topics by Region

	DIRECT SERVICE PERSONNEL	ADMINISTRATOR
REGION A	(1) Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	(1) Creating least restrictive alternatives
	(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instrument	(2) Communication strategies
	(3) Screening procedures for handicapping conditions	(3) Agencies and organizations serving the handicapped
	(4) Vocational careers/skill adjustment	
	(5) Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	
REGION B	(1) Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	(1) Conflict management and resolution
	(2) Vocational careers/skill adjustment	(2) Creating least restrictive alternatives
	(3) Screening procedures for handicapped students	(3) Program development strategies
		(4) Current case law in special education
		(5) Compliance management
		(6) Due process and school expulsion
		(7) Management information systems

TABLE 22 cont...

	DIRECT SERVICE PERSONNEL	ADMINISTRATOR
REGION C	(1) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	(1) Creating least restrictive alternatives
	(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	(2) School-community relationships
	(3) Developing community living skills	(3) Evaluating management services
	(4) Vocational assessment	(4) Goal development
REGION D	(1) Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	(1) Creating least restrictive alternatives
	(2) Knowledge of federal and state regulations	(2) Evaluating management services
	(3) Developing community living skills	(3) Program development strategies
	(4) Working with parents during screening and referral	(4) Current case law in special education
	(5) Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	
REGION E	(1) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	(1) Program development strategies
	(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	(2) Current case law in special education
	(3) Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	(3) Communication strategies
	(4) Vocational careers/skill adjustment	(4) Agencies and organizations serving the handicapped

TABLE 22 cont...

	DIRECT SERVICE PERSONNEL	ADMINISTRATOR
REGION F	(1) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	(1) Evaluating management services
	(2) Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	(2) Current case law in special education
	(3) Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	(3) Communication strategies
REGION G	(1) Working with parents during screening and referral	(1) Program development strategies
	(2) Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	(2) Communication strategies
	(3) Recognition of possible signs of handicapping conditions	(3) Administrative models in special education
REGION H	(1) Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	(1) Creating least restrictive alternatives
	(2) Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	(2) Evaluating management services
	(3) Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	(3) Program development strategies
		(4) Communication strategies
		(5) Special education financing

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire for Direct
Service Personnel

IN-SERVICE NEEDS SURVEY FOR MINNESOTA TEACHERS

1. Please provide the name and number of the school district in which you teach.

   Name:_____

   Number:_____

2. Please indicate the level of the students for which you have primary responsibility.

   _____ 1. Pre-kindergarten
   _____ 2. Elementary
   _____ 3. Middle school
   _____ 4. Junior High School
   _____ 5. Senior High School
   _____ 6. Other (specify):_____

3. Please indicate the position which you hold (check the one which most closely describes that position).

   _____ 1. Regular classroom teacher
   _____ 2. Teacher of educable mentally retarded
   _____ 3. Teacher of learning disabled
   _____ 4. Teacher of emotionally disturbed
   _____ 5. Teacher of visually handicapped
   _____ 6. Teacher of hearing handicapped
   _____ 7. Teacher of orthopedically handicapped
   _____ 8. Teacher of trainable mentally retarded
   _____ 9. Speech clinician
   _____ 10. School psychologist
   _____ 11. School social worker
   _____ 12. Related services personnel (O.T., P.T., etc.)
   _____ 13. Vocational/Special needs
   _____ 14. Other (specify):_____

4. Check all of the categories in which you are presently <u>fully</u> licensed.

   _____ 1. Educable metnally retarded
   _____ 2. Learning disabled
   _____ 3. Emotionally disturbed
   _____ 4. Visually handicapped

4. (cont.)

_____ 5. Hearing handicapped
_____ 6. Crippled children
_____ 7. Trainable mentally retarded
_____ 8. Speech handicapped
_____ 9. Elementary education
_____ 10. Secondary education
_____ 11. School psychologist
_____ 12. School social worker
_____ 13. K-12 physical education, music, etc.
_____ 14. Early childhood
_____ 15. Vocational/special needs

5. Check all of the categories in which you are presently <u>provisionally</u> licensed.

_____ 1. Educable mentally retarded
_____ 2. Learning disabled
_____ 3. Emotionally disabled
_____ 4. Hearing impaired
_____ 5. Visually handicapped
_____ 6. Trainable mentally retarded

6. If appropriate course work were available in your area, check the licenses which you would like to pursue.

_____ 1. Educable mentally retarded
_____ 2. Learning disabled
_____ 3. Emotionally disturbed
_____ 4. Visually handicapped
_____ 5. Hearing handicapped
_____ 6. Crippled children
_____ 7. Trainable mentally retarded
_____ 8. Speech handicapped
_____ 9. School psychologist
_____ 10. School social worker
_____ 11. Early childhood/handicapped
_____ 12. Adaptive physical education

7. Please rank the following topics in priority order with "1" being the highest priority and "9" being the lowest to indicate the broad major areas of in-service training which would be desirable for you.

_____ 1. Screening, identification, and referral of handicapped students
_____ 2. Assessment procedures for handicapped students
_____ 3. Development of individual educational plans
_____ 4. Design and implementation of appropriate instructional programs
_____ 5. Evaluation of student performance
_____ 6. Planning and using related services
_____ 7. Techniques of behavior management
_____ 8. Classroom organization and management
_____ 9. Developing and implementing instructional support services (level II)

8. Please rate the following in-service topics in terms of your own need for training. On this scale, "1" indicates little or no need for this type of training. A "5" indicates that you feel that such training would be highly beneficial. Circle the number.

		Need				
		Little				Great
A.	Recognition of possible signs of handicapping conditions.	1	2	3	4	5
B.	Screening procedures for handicapping conditions	1	2	3	4	5
C.	Working with parents during screening and referral	1	2	3	4	5
D.	Establishing eligibility of students for special education services	1	2	3	4	5
E.	Administration and interpretation of appropriate assessment instruments	1	2	3	4	5
F.	Observation techniques as an assessment device	1	2	3	4	5
G.	Role and functions of members of the staffing teams	1	2	3	4	5
H.	Reporting assessment results to parents and other school personnel	1	2	3	4	5
I.	Understanding the major components of the individual educational plan	1	2	3	4	5
J.	Developing goals and objectives from assessment data	1	2	3	4	5

8. (cont.)	Need				
	Little				Great
K. Various instructional approaches to curricular areas (reading, mathematics, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
L. Developing alternative instructional methods	1	2	3	4	5
M. Designing classrooms for more effective individualization of instruction	1	2	3	4	5
N. Implementation of various educational management systems (grouping, peer tutoring, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
O. Designing classrooms for more effective behavioral management	1	2	3	4	5
P. Measurement of academic and social behavior in the classroom	1	2	3	4	5
Q. Utilizing appropriate special education personnel to develop more effective programming	1	2	3	4	5
R. Evaluation of media and materials	1	2	3	4	5
S. Working with parents of handicapped students	1	2	3	4	5
T. Knowledge of federal and state regulations	1	2	3	4	5
U. Understanding of procedural safeguards	1	2	3	4	5
V. Identifying young (pre-school) handicapped children	1	2	3	4	5
W. Developing educational programs for young handicapped children	1	2	3	4	5
X. Developing vocational programs for handicapped children	1	2	3	4	5
Y. Vocational assessment	1	2	3	4	5
Z. Vocational careers/skills adjustment	1	2	3	4	5
AA. Developing community living skills	1	2	3	4	5
BB. Measuring student progress	1	2	3	4	5
CC. Other areas (please specify)_____	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire for Administrators

INSERVICE NEEDS SURVEY

FOR

MINNESOTA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

1. Please identify the school district in which you are employed by name and number.

   NAME: _____

   NUMBER: _____

2. Please indicate which position you presently hold.

   _____ 1. Superintendent
   _____ 2. Central office administrator other than superintendent
   _____ 3. Elementary principal
   _____ 4. Secondary principal
   _____ 5. Special education director
   _____ 6. Special education coordinator
   _____ 7. Other (specify): _____

3. Please rate the following in-service topics in terms of your own needs for training. On this scale, "1" indicates little or no need for this type of training. A "5" indicates that you feel that such training would be highly beneficial. Please circle the appropriate number.

		Need				
		Little				Great
A.	Assessing personnel needs in special education	1	2	3	4	5
B.	Recruiting and assigning special education personnel personnel	1	2	3	4	5
C.	Supervision and evaluation of special education personnel	1	2	3	4	5
D.	Data privacy	1	2	3	4	5
E.	Due process and school expulsion	1	2	3	4	5
F.	Administrative models in special education	1	2	3	4	5
G.	School-community relations	1	2	3	4	5
H.	Communication strategies	1	2	3	4	5
I.	Conflict management and resolution	1	2	3	4	5

		Need				
		Little				Great
J.	Assessing staff development needs	1	2	3	4	5
K.	Designing staff development programs	1	2	3	4	5
L.	Evaluating management services	1	2	3	4	5
M.	Evaluating child study systems	1	2	3	4	5
N.	Evaluating instructional programs	1	2	3	4	5
O.	Special education financing	1	2	3	4	5
P.	Current case law in special education	1	2	3	4	5
Q.	Effective management of related services	1	2	3	4	5
R.	Program development strategies	1	2	3	4	5
S.	Agencies and organizations serving the handicapped	1	2	3	4	5
T.	Creating least restrictive alternative in regular education	1	2	3	4	5
U.	Management information systems	1	2	3	4	5
V.	Compliance management	1	2	3	4	5
W.	Alternative models for special needs students	1	2	3	4	5
X.	Procedures for assuring quality programs	1	2	3	4	5
Y.	Technology for conducting meetings	1	2	3	4	5
Z.	Goal development	1	2	3	4	5
Others (please specify) _____		1	2	3	4	5